

Applic. No. 10/068,727

Amdt. dated May 25, 2004

Reply to Office action of February 25, 2004

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-8, 11-16, and 19-24 remain in the application.

Claims 1, 14, and 21 have been amended. Claims 10, 15, and 17 have been cancelled.

In item 3 on page 2 of the Office action, claims 1-4, 14, and 20, have been rejected as being obvious over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "Admitted Art") in view of Wilson (U.S. Patent No. 4,995,693) and Dewey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,577,926) under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

It is appreciatively noted that claims 10, 17, and 21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of allowable claim 10. Since claim 1 is allowable, dependent claims 3-4 are allowable as well.

Claim 14 has been amended to include the subject matter of allowable claim 17. Since claim 17 is allowable, dependent claim 20 is allowable as well.

Applic. No. 10/068,727

Amdt. dated May 25, 2004

Reply to Office action of February 25, 2004

Allowable claim 21 has been amended to include the subject matter of independent claim 14. Therefore, claim 21 is allowable.

In item 4 on page 4 of the Office action, claims 5 and 24, have been rejected as being obvious over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "Admitted Art") in view of Wilson (U.S. Patent No. 4,995,693) and Dewey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,577,926) and further in view of Ferguson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,780,806) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Since claims 1 and 14 are allowable, dependent claims 5 and 24 are allowable as well.

In item 5 on page 5 of the Office action, claims 6-8 and 15-16 have been rejected as being obvious over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "Admitted Art") in view of Wilson (U.S. Patent No. 4,995,693) and Dewey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,577,926) and further in view of Latta (U.S. Patent No. 4,295,145) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Since claims 1 and 14 are allowable, dependent claims 6-8 and 15-16 are allowable as well.

In item 6 on page 5 of the Office action, claims 11-13, 19, and 22-23 have been rejected as being obvious over Applicants'

Applic. No. 10/068,727  
Amdt. dated May 25, 2004  
Reply to Office action of February 25, 2004

Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "Admitted Art") in view of Wilson (U.S. Patent No. 4,995,693) and Dewey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,577,926) and further in view of Roberts (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,222) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Since claims 1 and 14 are allowable, dependent claims 11-13, 19, and 22-23 are allowable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-8, 11-14, 16, and 19-24 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Applic. No. 10/068,727


Amdt. dated May 25, 2004

Reply to Office action of February 25, 2004

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner & Greenberg P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

**Alfred K. Dassler**  
**52,794**

  
For Applicant(s)

AKD:cgm

May 25, 2004

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101